Overview: The CIC CIO campus consultation team met with key members of the University of Iowa leadership and IT communities to examine the state of the University’s “hybrid” IT service model that involves both institutional IT (ITS) and collegiate and functional unit IT organizations in delivering campus IT services from the core (centralized and at scale) and from the edge (local and customized). The consultation team hopes this interaction and the following report will provide value to the University.

General responses about satisfaction with the “hybrid” IT service model that emerged from the 1.5 days of interviews involving 58 University leaders ranged from generally satisfied to very satisfied, with strong enthusiasm for core services that can be customized by units for end-users. The consultation team identified four primary themes from interviewees’ responses that the consultants believed may present some opportunities for the University. These themes are listed below along with key observations and opportunities for action.

**Theme 1: Campus IT services planning should have more rigor, and strategic, tactical, and operational communication should be more comprehensive.**

**Key observations:**
- Clear and effective communication between and among Campus IT units about priorities, planning, and delivery of IT services has improved tremendously over the past decade, but can and should improve further.
- The organization of IT community groups is widely regarded as a strength in communication.
- Needs, requirements, plans, and priorities are not well understood among and between the Campus IT units.

**Opportunities for action:**
- Anything less than full engagement by all Campus IT units in gathering needs requirements and setting plans and priorities will leave this as an outstanding issue.
- The CIO and CITL should co-design an IT communications strategy.
- The experimental dual report of the CLAS IT director to the college Dean and the CIO appears to be having success, with observed benefits including persistence in communications and planning, ongoing opportunities to maintain and build upon existing trust and confidence, deeper insight to Colleges need, etc. Consideration should given to building upon the success of this dynamic.
- ITS should consider organizationally addressing the improvement of partnerships with Schools and departments by assigning a staff liaison to aid in the delivery of new innovations to ease the burden of discovery and integration, and to ensure the service can be more seamlessly adopted when appropriate.
**Theme 2: Campus IT (ITS, college IT, and functional unit IT) needs to mature processes for services lifecycle management to become more flexible, responsive, as well as consistently reliable.**

**Key observations:**
- A process by which to identify new IT services was not widely known or recognized.
- It was a belief from many involved that innovation or the introduction of new services often occurred closest to the faculty, students and business users of the University, but that services should be supported centrally when they become ubiquitous or commodity services.
- Both the staff of the ITS and the Schools and departments desire more integration and partnership in the delivery of new systems and services.
- The creation of new IT technology platforms or services are often made and delivered by Schools and departments in isolation. It should be recognized that all IT decisions have impact on others.
- The decision to move IT services from the edge to the core, and vice versa, appeared rational, but also ad hoc and without much process, rigor or analysis. This leads to periods of duplication as ITS develops systems after they have been delivered by many Schools and departments and sometimes a step back in quality as the specialized application becomes generalized. If processes for services movement were commonly understood and effectively executed, frustration would be greatly reduced.

**Opportunities for action:**
- ITS, in close consultation with collegiate and functional unit IT leaders, should determine and use processes for identifying and prioritizing new IT services, as well as for determining when to move an IT service from edge to core or vice versa. These processes, at minimum, should include the following:
  - What are processes for determining, communicating, and re-evaluating priority for IT services development, transition, and deprecation?
  - What are criteria for determining sufficient need for a new IT service?
  - What are the criteria for making a core IT service?
  - What are the incentive models for adoption of IT services?
  - What are the incentive models for distribution/re-distribution of IT services?

**Theme 3: The University needs to become more intentional, systematic and open regarding decision-making involving priorities and strategies related to IT.**

**Key observations:**
- We observed, from distributed and central units alike, an imbalance in unit optimization versus institutional optimization.
- Decision-making and priority-setting related to IT services seems to be a collection of local or regional rationalizing, at best.
- There was a widespread lack of recognition among interviewees of any intentional or systematic campus approach to make decisions involving priorities and strategies related to IT.
There was little evidence of structured involvement of Deans and Administrators in IT services strategies or priority-setting.

**Opportunities for action:**
• Infuse a more global perspective into decision-making and priority-setting related to IT services to accomplish University-wide strategic objectives.
• A structure and process should be developed to ensure that all units are accountable and engaged in the decision-making and development of IT strategies and priorities.
• While there are many domain-specific IT communities that are providing value to their members, the consultants felt more could be asked of them; e.g., informing decision-making and priority-setting processes.

**Theme 4: IT Leaders from ITS, HCIS, the Clinical enterprise, and the Carver College of Medicine, need to examine service offerings, identify strengths of each unit, and allocate and optimize to achieve more effective IT services.**

**Key observations:**
• Even though the College of Medicine was only a small part of the “hybrid” IT services exploration, many interviewees across a range of areas within the University widely observed and reported their experience with the problems between ITS and the Healthcare enterprise. As such, the consultation team felt it necessary to address this in this report.
• Research support, in general, would appear to be under-supported in the College of Medicine. Hence, Medical faculty often reach out to ITS for research and other IT support, which creates tension between ITS and HCIS.

**Opportunities for action:**
• Interviewees reported that the Medical Center and College are responsible for nearly 60% of funded research at the University. The consultants believe that uncoordinated IT services present a risk to the entire University research enterprise and that this problem needs to be resolved.
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